

**Basin Study Work Group:  
Crooked River Subgroup Meeting**

April 23, 9:30 AM – 12:00 PM  
Prineville City Hall, 387 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> St, Prineville, OR 97754

**Attending**

Dan Bruce – Terrebonne Valley Water District  
Steve Forester – City of Prineville  
Chris Gannon – Crooked River Watershed  
Council  
Nancy Gilbert – Fish and Wildlife Service  
Brett Golden – Deschutes River Conservancy  
Brett Hodgson – Oregon Department of Fish  
and Wildlife  
Mike Kasberger – Ochoco Irrigation District  
Eric Klann – City of Prineville

Bonnie Lamb – Oregon Department of  
Environmental Quality  
Peter Lickwar – Fish and Wildlife Service  
Michelle McSwain - Bureau of Land  
Management  
Kimberley Priestley – WaterWatch (by phone)  
Betty Roppe – City of Prineville  
Garry Sanders – Crooked River Watershed  
Council  
Mike Tripp -Trout Unlimited

Also attending were Mary Orton, The Mary Orton Company (facilitator), and Kate Fitzpatrick from the Deschutes River Conservancy in her capacity as Process Co-Coordinator.

**Agenda**

The group used the following agenda as a guide during the meeting:

1. Welcome: Betty Roppe, Chair
2. Introductions
3. Overview and approval of agenda: Mary Orton, Facilitator
4. Review of consensus direction provided the BSWG by the Crooked Subgroup, and resulting questions: Kate Fitzpatrick, BSWG Co-Coordinator
  - See Attachment
5. How much water is available for multiple uses in different water years (wet, average, dry)?  
Refine the questions to be answered with modeling:
  - Impacts on irrigators of ODFW's balanced and dry year flow scenarios?
  - Impacts of first fill on meeting these scenarios?
  - Impacts to flatwater recreation of these scenarios?
  - Other?
6. How do we best manage the water to benefit prioritized fish species and water quality and balance multiple needs?  
The questions to be addressed here include:
  - What are the high-priority fish species?
  - What are the water quality parameters we want to meet?
  - What are the multiple needs we want to address?
7. Next steps
  - Action items and parking lot
  - Report to BSWG
  - Next meeting of the Crooked Subgroup
  - Agenda for next meeting
8. Meeting evaluation

Adjourn

### Overview and Approval of Agenda

Chair Betty Roppe opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. Mary invited people to introduce themselves and reviewed the agenda.

### Review of consensus direction provided the BSWG by the Crooked Subgroup, and resulting questions

Kate clarified that, in the Attachment (attached here), only the text under the **Direction** paragraph is what the group agreed. **The Resulting Questions to Be Addressed by the Crooked Subgroup** were not discussed or approved by the group, but only suggestions for the group to consider during this meeting regarding how they might move forward.

Kimberley noted that the **Direction** language is different than what was agreed upon at the last meeting and recorded in the minutes, in that it refers to multiple demands and not just instream demands. Mary reminded the group that the “Direction” section was developed by them after the meeting via email in order to have a consensus about what Betty would report to the BSWG Steering Committee. She read the emails that confirmed that the subgroup members, including Kimberley, agreed to that language via email after the meeting. Mary noted that we could have indicated in the minutes that the agreement was made afterward the meeting with the consensus of the group. Kate suggested that the consensus direction may need to be revisited since it may confuse the distinction between identifying demands and balancing demands.

Mike Kasberger noted that the **Resulting Questions** are interconnected with two other independent but related processes. The Crooked River legislation is addressing how much water is available, and the Habitat Conservation Plan should be addressing instream demand questions in its studies. Nancy agreed, and said we don’t yet know when they will intersect. She suggested following a process similar to the Deschutes Instream Subgroup to look at these very questions in a methodical way. This could help clarify where the other processes might feed in and identify data gaps that remain. This could also help put a structure around these conversations and integrate processes, prioritize needs, clarify timelines, etc. Betty noted that Marty Vaughan (the HCP contractor) is doing studies in the Crooked right now that will be available to us.

Brett Hodgson expressed support for a process like what the Deschutes Instream Subgroup is doing: identifying priority reaches where they see additional data collection as useful to understanding how flows would impact fish and frogs, in the case of the Upper Deschutes. While initially he wasn’t seeing value in a full-blown IFIM for the Crooked, additional data would be very useful for tackling question #2: How do we best manage the water to benefit prioritized fish species and water quality and balance multiple needs?

Kate suggested that the first step, as they did in the Deschutes Instream Subgroup, is to establish priority instream values, and then to identify data gaps related to understanding how flow effects those values. Brett Golden suggested some additional questions:

- What are the priorities for instream needs?
- How much water do you need to meet these priorities?
- If legislation doesn’t pass, how do we meet these priorities?

Kimberley suggested that we need data on the needs of fish whether or not the legislation passes. If it does pass, this data will help inform decisions by the State and tribes in releasing the water. She also noted that there is disagreement on whether water behind Bowman Dam can currently be used for fish. Some parties at the HCP table believe it can and some don't. Nancy agreed with this clarification, and noted that the Services did not resolve this issue, but consciously set it aside so that they could move ahead.

Michelle questioned how to move forward from here with legislation pending, and asked if it would be necessary to consider two different paths, one if the legislation passes and another if it does not.

Mary asked the group to come to some agreement about how to address this legislative issue. Kate clarified that the legislation deals with solutions to the supply and demand imbalance, which is just one step of the basin study. Other Basin Study steps, including improving the understanding of water demands and existing operations, is not affected by the legislation. She stressed that while the Basin Study generates information, it does not make agreements; therefore, she suggested that the group should consider what information it would like generated to help make water management decisions.

- Betty suggested that the group move forward without regard for the legislation. If it passes, the group can address any changes then.
- Nancy said if the purpose is to generate information, the instream flow approach from the Deschutes River Instream Flow Subgroup would work well for the Crooked.
- Mike Tripp said he thought that answers to both of the "resulting questions" in the Attachment are needed, regardless of whether the legislation passes. Reclamation needs to know the supply side: how much water is available for fish. How to use this water to best meet fish needs would provide good information for the fish committee set up in the legislation to shape releases. These questions complement the legislative process.

**The group reached agreement (consensus with all green cards) on the following language, "Move forward with conditions as is, while addressing supply and demand. While addressing solutions, we may need to consider the HCP and legislation. Throughout, we will be careful not to undermine the legislation."**

Kimberley cautioned the group not to do anything in the BSWG process that would negatively affect the legislation. For example, she suggested the following language from the Attachment could negatively affect the legislation: "impacts to flatwater recreation" of these scenarios. She advocated for a path forward open to all interests that doesn't put the legislative partners in a bind. **The group agreed, after discussion (consensus – all green cards), to use the wording: "impacts to reservoir storage and pool elevations" instead of "impacts to flatwater recreation."**

Chris Gannon suggested adding "associated benefits and impacts" to 1(c) of the Attachment and Kimberley agreed. Kate suggested that the second question should focus just on instream needs, because keeping the identification of demands separate from solutions that balance demands fits better within the basin study framework.

Kate asked whether the group was comfortable modifying the previous direction and thinking about a process focused just on instream demands. Michelle asked if that could include ecosystem function. Brett Golden suggested three questions to focus on:

- What are our instream priorities?
- What reaches and times of year are important for those priorities?

- What flow is needed for those priorities in those reaches? (perhaps answered through Plan of Study tasks)

Eric proposed a fourth question, looking at the impact of those flows on other values (i.e., high flows and flooding risk). The group discussed that the irrigation and municipal needs were better understood than the instream flow needs, so that should be focused on. Brett G. suggested that impacts on other values is an important question, but not for a group focused on instream demands. Impacts and the need to balance demands will be considered later in the Basin Study process.

Mike Tripp suggested keeping question #1 from the direction because understanding supply is important, and dropping the question #2, while looking at instream demand through the proposed framework.

Peter noted that there is a lot missing from these questions, and requested a placeholder that there will be more specifics. That will be the work of the group.

**The group agreed to convene a subgroup focused on instream demands, to answer the three questions listed above, and to use a process like the Deschutes Instream Subgroup to do so. Consensus with all green cards except one yellow card (Chris Gannon felt it was still too general, but is OK moving forward with it, because the heart of the specifics will come in filling out the matrix).**

The group agreed that the following technical people should get together to do this work: Chris Gannon, Garry Sanders, Brett Hodgson, Brett Golden, Nancy Gilbert, Bonnie Lamb, Michelle McSwain, Peter Lickwar, Bob Spateholts (PGE), Scott Carlon (NMFS – Nancy to call), and Mike Tripp. Brett Golden will serve as lead. This group will have recommendations at the end of May and the full group will meet in early June.

The meeting was adjourned.

## Attachment: Consensus Direction from January 22, 2014 Crooked Subgroup and Resulting Questions

### Direction

The group agrees that the Basin Study will be important to help refine instream needs and water management scenarios in the lower Crooked River, Ochoco, and McKay Creeks. The group has generated the following priority questions for the Basin Study:

- How much water is available for multiple uses in different water years (wet, average, dry)?
- How do we best manage this water to benefit prioritized fish species and water quality and balance multiple needs?

The group agreed, after the proposal is submitted, to address what species and reaches were highest priority. They also agreed that much research data exists already that should be referenced. In preparation for the Plan of Study, the group will also be discussing Adaptation and Mitigation Strategies they feel are important for further analysis in the Basin Study.

### Resulting Questions to be Addressed by the Crooked Subgroup

#### 1. How much water is available for multiple uses in different water years (wet, average, dry)?

The Subgroup agreed that they would recommend to the Steering Committee that the Plan of Study include funding for Reclamation to model this question.

To be done: Refine the questions to be answered with modeling, for example:

- a. Impacts on irrigators of ODFW's balanced and dry year flow scenarios?
- b. Impacts of first fill on meeting these scenarios?
- c. Impacts to flatwater recreation of these scenarios?
- d. Other?

#### 2. How do we best manage the water to benefit prioritized fish species and water quality and balance multiple needs?

To be done: Address the following questions:

- a. What are the high-priority fish species?
- b. What are the water quality parameters we want to meet?
- c. What are the multiple needs we want to address?

Once these three questions are answered, we can address how to manage for all these, including identifying priority reaches. Throughout the discussion, we will identify data gaps.